

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

FLEXUSPINE, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.,

Defendant,

Civil Action No. 6:15-cv-00201 (JRG-KNM)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT'S
AMENDED VERDICT FORM**

In answering these questions, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's charge.

Question No. 1

Did Flexuspine prove that Globus's Caliber satisfies all limitations of claim 1 of the '853 Patent?

Answer "yes" or "no." _____

A "yes" answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A "no" answer is a finding for Globus.

Question No. 2

Did Flexuspine prove that Globus's Caliber-L satisfies all limitations of claim 1 of the '853 Patent?

Answer "yes" or "no." _____

A "yes" answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A "no" answer is a finding for Globus.

Question No. 3

Did Globus prove that claim 1 of the '853 Patent is anticipated by the prior art?

Answer "yes" or "no." _____

A "yes" answer is a finding for Globus. A "no" answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 4

Did Globus prove that claim 1 of the '853 Patent is obvious under the prior art?

Answer "yes" or "no." _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 5

Did Globus prove that claim 1 of the '853 Patent does not meet the enablement requirement of the patent laws?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 6

Did Flexuspine prove that Globus’s Altera satisfies all limitations of claim 1 of the '714 Patent?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A “no” answer is a finding for Globus.

Question No. 7

Did Globus prove that claim 1 of the '714 Patent is anticipated by the prior art?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 8

Did Globus prove that claim 1 of the '714 Patent is obvious under the prior art?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 9

Did Globus prove that claim 1 of the '714 Patent does not meet the enablement requirement of the patent laws?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 10

Did Flexuspine prove that Globus’s Altera satisfies all limitations of claim 2 of the '714 Patent?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A “no” answer is a finding for Globus.

Question No. 11

Did Globus prove that claim 2 of the '714 Patent is anticipated by the prior art?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 12

Did Globus prove that claim 2 of the '714 Patent is obvious under the prior art?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 13

Did Globus prove that claim 2 of the '714 Patent does not meet the enablement requirement of the patent laws?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Globus. A “no” answer is a finding for Flexuspine.

Question No. 14

Did Flexuspine prove that it complied with its obligations to provide notice and mark its products?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A “no” answer is a finding for Globus.

Question No. 15

Answer this question **only** if you found infringement of at least one claim (Questions 1, 2, 6, and 10), and did not find that same claim invalid (Questions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13).

Otherwise, do not answer this question.

What sum of money, if any, do you find would fairly and reasonably compensate Flexuspine for Globus's infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer by providing an amount and checking one of the following boxes.

Amount: \$ _____

In the form of:

- ☐ a one-time, lump sum paid as of the date of the hypothetical negotiation covering all past and future infringing use, or
- ☐ a running royalty from the date of the hypothetical negotiation covering all past infringing use up to the time of the trial.

Questions No. 16 – 18

Answer these questions **only** if you found infringement (Questions 1, 2, 6, and 10). Otherwise, do not answer these questions.

16. Did Flexuspine prove that Globus willfully infringed claim 1 of the '853 Patent?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A “no” answer is a finding for Globus.

17. Did Flexuspine prove that Globus willfully infringed claim 1 of the '714 Patent?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A “no” answer is a finding for Globus.

18. Did Flexuspine prove that Globus willfully infringed claim 2 of the '714 Patent?

Answer “yes” or “no.” _____

A “yes” answer is a finding for Flexuspine. A “no” answer is a finding for Globus.

DATED: August 12, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/John P. Lahad

Arun S. Subramanian (Lead)

NY State Bar No.: 4611869

Jacob W. Buchdahl (*Pro Hac Vice*)

NY State Bar No.: 2903383

Mark H. Hatch-Miller (*Pro Hac Vice*)

NY State Bar No.: 4981635

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Fl.

New York, NY 10019

Telephone: (212) 336-8330

Fascimile: (212) 336-8340

asubramanian@susmangodfrey.com

jbuchdahl@susmangodfrey.com

mhatch-miller@susmangodfrey.com

Richard W. Hess

TX State Bar No. 24046070

John P. Lahad

TX State Bar No. 24068095

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100

Houston, Texas 77002-5096

Telephone: (713) 653-7859

Fascimile: (713) 654-6666

rhess@susmangodfrey.com

jlahad@susmangodfrey.com

S. Calvin Capshaw

State Bar No. 03783900

Capshaw DeRieux LLP

114 E. Commerce Ave.

Gladewater, Texas 75647

Telephone: (903) 845-5770

Email: ccapshaw@capshawlaw.com

***Attorneys for Defendant
Globus Medical, Inc.***

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on August 12, 2016, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the parties to this action by electronically filing true and correct copies with the Clerk of the Court using the ECM/ECF system which automatically sent notification by e-mail of such filing to all counsel of record.

/s/ John P. Lahad

John P. Lahad